

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14 and 16-27 are in the application, with Claims 25-27 having been added. Claims 1, 12 and 14 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5-6, 11-12, 14, and 16-24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Magill et al. US Publication No. 2004/0143542 (“Magill”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,728 (“Kane”).

This rejection is respectfully traversed for reasons given below.

Claim 1 is directed to an “apparatus for a computerized trading system”. The claimed apparatus includes “a logic engine comprising an algorithm for implementing a trading strategy” and “an interface comprising a first sub-interface and a second sub-interface”. Claim 1 further specifies that “said first sub-interface allows a user to modify said algorithm by changing a mapping between an event and an action”, “said second sub-interface allows the user to review details of orders executed by the logic engine” and “said interface allows the user to navigate among said first and second sub-interfaces”.

Applicants wish to particularly emphasize the claim limitation which provides a “first sub-interface [that] allows a user to modify [an algorithm for implementing a trading strategy] by changing a mapping between an event and an action”. Contrary to what is stated in the present Office Action, the Magill reference fails to teach or suggest this limitation. It is noted that in discussing this claim limitation, the Examiner referenced paragraph 0056 of Magill. However, this paragraph merely refers to a color scheme for a graphical user interface (GUI) and allowing a user to specify a color in which the user’s outstanding orders are to be displayed. This has nothing whatsoever to do with an interface which allows a user to modify a trading algorithm by changing a mapping between an event and an action, as recited in claim 1. Nowhere in this paragraph is there any mention of either an event or an action, nor a mapping therebetween. Changing a color in a display is not changing a mapping between an event and an action.

More generally, in its aspects that are most pertinent hereto, Magill describes an interface which allows a user to interact with a book of securities trading orders (see, e.g., paragraph 0057

of the reference). However, Magill does not in any respect teach or suggest providing an interface that allows a user to modify a trading strategy by changing a mapping between an event and an action. In this regard, it is to be noted that Magill contains no disclosure of interface screens like those shown in FIGS. 16-18 of the present application.

Thus, Magill fails to support the Examiner's reliance thereon, and fails to disclose at least one limitation recited in claim 1. This deficiency in the Magill reference is not supplied by the Kane reference, and it follows that the rejection of claim 1 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The above remarks concerning claim 1 are also applicable to the other independent claims 12 and 14, which both recite a sub-interface to modify a trading strategy algorithm by changing a mapping between an event and an action.

Applicants note in passing that, at least in regard to the proposed rejection of dependent claims 17, 20, 23, the Examiner's proposal to combine the teachings of the Kane reference with the Magill reference is not well taken. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to incorporate the automatic/artificial-intelligence-based trading strategies of Kane into the system of Magill, since the latter calls for manual placement of buy/sell orders by a user who is interacting with an order book.

Applicants also note, with respect to dependent claims 18, 21, 24, that the cited portion of Magill--paragraphs 53-60--have nothing to do with any one of an event editor interface, a condition editor interface and an action editor interface. Rather, the description in paragraphs 53-60 describes a browser-based GUI in general terms, discusses color coding of displayed orders, explains how users may enter and cancel orders and otherwise interact with an order book. Neither does the balance of Magill teach the limitations of claims 18, 21, 24.

The new claims 25-27 are all dependent claims, which are submitted as patentable at least because of the patentability of their parent independent claims. Each of the new claims recites the limitation that the action mapped to the event "is placement of a securities trading order". Support for this feature is found at FIGS. 16 and 19 of the present application and at page 19, lines 20-23 and page 20, lines 14-15 of the specification.



CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

October 21, 2005
Date

Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460